



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,697	10/16/2003	Paul A. Kohl	62020-1550	7668
7590 Paul Reznick, Esq. THE WEBB LAW FIRM 700 Koppers Building 436 Seveth Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15219				
07/24/2009				
EXAMINER				
LEE, SIN J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1795				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/686,697

Applicant(s)

KOHLE ET AL.

Examiner

Sin J. Lee

Art Unit

1795

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 14-17 and 20-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 14-17, 20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the amendment, previous 102(b) rejection on claim 9 over Teng'208 is hereby withdrawn.
2. In view of the amendment, the effective filing date of present claim 9 is October 16, 2002. Thus, previous 102(e) rejection on claim 9 over Kohl'718 and previous 102(a) rejection on claim 9 over Wu et al (Journal of Applied Polymer Science, Vol.88, pg.1186-1195 (2003)) are hereby withdrawn.
3. In view of Kohl's Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131, previous 102(e) rejection and previous 103(a) rejection over Gallagher et al are hereby withdrawn.
4. Due to newly cited prior art, the following rejection is made non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kohl et al (6,165,890).

Kohl teaches the following (see col.4, lines 52-67, col.5, lines 1-6);



FIG. 1A



FIG. 1B




FIG. 1C




FIG. 1D

In Figs. 1A and 1B, a patterned layer of sacrificial material 20 is formed on a substrate 22 by any suitable technique (for example by etching). A second solid layer of a non-sacrificial material 24 is then formed on the patterned layer in overlying relation to the patterned layer 20 as depicted in Fig. 1C. Then, heat is applied to decompose sacrificial material into one or more gaseous decomposition products, and one or more of these decomposition products are removed by passing through the second layer 24. This provides an air-gap structure 28 having one or more air gaps 25 in the closed interior

space or spaces previously occupied by the sacrificial material 20. The structure in Fig.1D thus formed teaches present structures of claims 20-22.

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thornton*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claim 9 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of copending Application No. 12/140,539. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of App.'539 teaches a polymer composition containing an alkenyl-substituted polynorbornene (present sacrificial polymer—see pg.8, line 2 of present specification) and claim 6 of App.'539 teaches present bis(2,4,6-trimethylbenzoyl)-phenylphosphineoxide as one of the two photoinitiator examples. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to choose

bis(2,4,6-trimethylbenzoyl)-phenylphosphineoxide as the photoinitiator with a reasonable expectation of success. Thus, App.'539 renders obvious present invention of claim 9.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

9. Claims 14-17 and 20-22 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11, 14-17 and 20 of copending Application No. 11/451,144. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 11 and 14 (combined together) of App.'144 teach present method of claim 14. Claims 15-17 of App.'144 teaches present claims 15-17. Claim 20 of App.'144 teaches present inventions of claims 20-22.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sin J. Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-1333. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 am EST to 5:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly, can be reached on 571-272-1526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 1795

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sin J. Lee/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795

July 20, 2009